

# Title II of the Higher Education Act

## Institutional Report

### APPENDIX C

#### Annual Institutional Questionnaire on Teacher Preparation:

**Academic year: 2001-2002**

Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education

**Report Year 3:** (Fall 2001, Winter, 2002, Summer 2002)

Institution name:	Columbia College		
Respondent name and title:	Becky Widener, Department Chair		
Respondent phone number:	573-875-7679	Fax: 573-875-7209	
Electronic mail address:	bjwidener@email.ccis.edu		
Address:	1001 Rogers Street		
City:	Columbia	State: MO	Zip code: 65216

### Section I. Pass rates.

Please provide the information in Tables C1 and C2 on the performance of completers of the teacher preparation program in your institution on teacher certification/licensure assessments used by your state.

Program completers for whom information should be provided are those completing program requirements in the most recent academic year. Thus, for institutional reports due to the state by April 7, 2001, the relevant information is for those completing program requirements in academic year 1999-2000. For purposes of this report, program completers do not include those who have completed an alternative route to certification or licensure as defined by the state.

The assessments to be included are the ones taken by these completers up to 5 years before their completion of program requirements, or up to 3 years afterward. (Please note that in 3 years institutions will report final pass rates that include an update on this cohort of completers; the update will reflect scores reported after the test closure date.) See guide pages 10 and 11.

In cases where a program completer has taken a given assessment more than once, the highest score on that test must be used. There must be at least 10 program completers taking the same assessment in an academic year for data on that assessment to be reported; for aggregate or summary data, there must also be at least 10 program completers (although not necessarily taking the same assessment) for data to be reported.

Note: The procedures for developing the information required for these tables are explained in the National Center for Education Statistics document entitled *Reference and Reporting Guide for Preparing State and Institutional Reports on the Quality of Teacher Preparation: Title II, Higher Education Act*. Terms and phrases in this questionnaire are defined in the glossary, appendix B of the guide.

### Section I. Pass rates.

**Table C1: Single-Assessment Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program**

<i>Table C-1</i>	<i>HEA - Title II 2001-2002 Academic Year</i>
<b>Institution Name</b>	Columbia College
<b>Institution Code</b>	6095
<b>State</b>	Missouri
<b>Number of Program Completers Submitted</b>	41

Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations <sup>1</sup>	35				Statewide		
Type of Assessment	Assessment Code Number	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Institutional Pass Rate	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Statewide Pass Rate
<b>Professional Knowledge</b>							
<b>Academic Content Areas</b>							
Elem Edu: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	011	17	17	100%	1679	1606	96%
English Lang., Lit. and Comp. : Content Knowledge	041	3			192	191	99%
MS English-Language Arts: Content Knowledge	049	2			31	30	97%
MS Mathematics: Content Knowledge	069	2			51	49	96%
MS Science: Content Knowledge	439	2			39	97	95%
Social Studies: Content Knowledge	081	6			276	270	98%
<b>Other Content Areas</b>							
Business Education	100	3			64	64	100%
<b>Teaching Special Populations</b>							

Table C2: Aggregate And Summary Institution-Level Pass-rate Data: Regular Teacher Preparation Program							
Table C-2		HEA - Title II 2001-2002 Academic Year					
Institution Name		Columbia College					
Institution Code		6095					
State		Missouri					
Number of Program Completers Submitted		41					
Number of Program Completers found, matched, and used in passing rate Calculations <sup>1</sup>		35			Statewide		
Type of Assessment <sup>2</sup>	Number Taking Assessment <sup>3</sup>	Number Passing Assessment <sup>4</sup>	Institutional Pass Rate	Number Taking Assessment <sup>3</sup>	Number Passing Assessment <sup>4</sup>	Statewide Pass Rate	
Aggregate - Basic Skills							
Aggregate - Professional Knowledge				10	9	90%	
Aggregate - Academic Content Areas (Math, English, Biology, etc.)	32	32	100%	3275	3155	96%	
Aggregate - Other Content Areas (Career/Technical Education, Health Educations, etc.)	2			156	156	100%	
Aggregate - Teaching Special Populations (Special Education, ELS, etc.)				270	256	95%	
Aggregate - Performance Assessments							

<b>Summary Totals and Pass Rates<sup>5</sup></b>	35	35	100%	3711	3575	96%
--	----	----	------	------	------	-----

<sup>1</sup> The number of program completers found, matched and used in the passing rate calculation will not equal the sum of the column labeled "Number Taking Assessment" since a completer can take more than one assessment.

<sup>2</sup> Institutions and/or States did not require the assessments within an aggregate where data cells are blank.

<sup>3</sup> Number of completers who took one or more tests in a category and within their area of specialization.

<sup>4</sup> Number who passed all tests they took in a category and within their area of specialization.

<sup>5</sup> Summary Totals and Pass Rate: Number of completers who successfully completed one or more tests across all categories used by the state for licensure and the total pass rate.

## **Section II. Program information.**

A Number of students in the regular teacher preparation program at your institution:

Please specify the number of students in your teacher preparation program during academic year 2001-2002, including all areas of specialization.

1. Total number of students enrolled during 2001-2002: **63**

B Information about supervised student teaching:

2. How many students (in the regular program and any alternative route programs) were in programs of supervised student teaching during academic year 2001-2002? **41**

3. Please provide the numbers of supervising faculty who were:

**2** Appointed full-time faculty in professional education: an individual who works full time in a school, college, or department of education, and spends at least part of the time in supervision of teacher preparation students.

**0** Appointed part-time faculty in professional education and full-time in the institution: any full time faculty member in the institution who also may be supervising or teaching in the teacher preparation program.

**1** Appointed part-time faculty in professional education, not otherwise employed by the institution: may be part time university faculty or pre-K-12 teachers who supervise prospective teachers. The numbers do not include K-12 teachers who simply receive a stipend for supervising student teachers. Rather, this third category is intended to reflect the growing trend among institutions of higher education to appoint K-12 teachers as clinical faculty, with the rights and responsibilities of the institution's regular faculty.

Supervising faculty for purposes of this data collection includes all persons who the institution regards as having faculty status and who were assigned by the teacher preparation program to provide supervision and evaluation of student teaching, with an administrative link or relationship to the teacher preparation program.

Total number of supervising faculty for the teacher preparation program during 2001-2002: **3**

4. The student/faculty ratio was (divide the total given in B2. by the number given in B3.): **7/1**

5. The average number of hours per week required of student participation in supervised student teaching in these programs was: **40** hours. The total number of weeks of supervised student teaching required is **10**.

6. The total number of hours required is 400 hours.

C Information about state approval or accreditation of teacher preparation programs:

6. Is your teacher preparation program currently approved or accredited by the state?

**X** Yes        No

7. Is your teacher preparation program currently under a designation as "low-performing" by the state (as per section 208 (a) of the HEA of 1998)?        Yes **X** No

8.

NOTE: See appendix A of the guide for the legislative language referring to “low-performing” programs.

### **Section III. Contextual information (optional).**

**A. Please use this space to provide any additional information that describes your teacher preparation program(s).**

**B. Missouri has asked each institution to include at least the following information.**

#### **1. Institution Mission**

Columbia College assists individuals in gaining a broad understanding of the liberal arts and sciences through exemplary teaching. Learning is made possible by the discovery, acquisition, and application of knowledge, diverse learning experiences, and the totality of interaction among faculty, staff, and students. In both undergraduate and graduate education, the College encourages intellectual growth, preparation for the world of work, involved citizenship, and lifelong learning in order to pursue excellence in human endeavor.

#### **2. Educational Philosophy**

Columbia College seeks to provide both those who are exploring teaching as a career choice and those who have made a commitment to education experiences that will enhance fundamental knowledge of educational principles and meet their developmental needs. Columbia College and the college Department of Education seek to prepare individuals for advancement in their profession and recognizes the importance of developing the whole person through the emphasis on serious scholastic endeavor and broadening of educational opportunity.

Columbia College Department of Education in conjunction with the Columbia Public Schools and the Professional Standards Teachers Committee worked to establish guidelines along with dedicated teachers in the system that share the responsibility for developing and promoting excellence in teaching. Columbia College encourages intellectual growth, preparation for the world of work, involved citizenship, and lifelong learning in order to pursue excellence in human endeavor.

The Department of Education promotes the mission of Columbia College in its efforts to provide personal and direct service for students of all ages, interests, abilities, and backgrounds. The department maintains high and ethical standards for students at both the entry and advanced levels. All students accepted into the education program are treated in an ethical and humane manner.

The Department of Education recognizes the seriousness of the responsibilities inherent in the teaching profession, and provides opportunities for growth and development for prospective teachers, promotes competent and reflective teaching, and maintains high expectations and standards for professional and nonprofessional staff.

The Education Department of Columbia College continues to seek its highest level by being committed to “Building a community of learners by eliciting and supporting human learning.” (Barth, 1990)

#### **3. Conceptual Frameworks**

The Reflective Decision Maker Model, grounded in the work of the theorists from Dewey (1993) through Schon (1987), Kennedy (1989), and Valli (1992), centers on a commitment to reform through a conception of good teaching, and an orientation which emphasizes a knowledge base grounded in current research, tempered with analytic skills which encourage independent thought and reflection, to provide the basis for professional decision making. Based on cognitive psychology and constructivist theory, the model attempts to prepare educators who integrate a strong theory base with experience, subjecting both to reflective analysis and arriving at a synthesis before making decisions. The movements toward site based management and the empowerment of teachers make this models relevant and appropriate. The model fosters the development of teachers as educational leaders who use critical and creative thinking, recognize that teaching is a highly complex learner

and context specific phenomena, and employ collaboration, reflection, and action research as means of meeting the needs of learners, school and community.

The Developing Professional Model complements and supports the Reflective Decision Maker Model, recognizing that development occurs when there is opportunity for inquiry and practice. This inquiry must include the same components as that of Reflective Decision Maker, namely opportunities for collaboration and for reflective inquiry tied to decision making and eventually action research.

The works of Berliner (2988) and Katz (1972) and others have documented the belief that teachers pass through developmental stages in their careers. Teachers themselves have documented their growth in narrative form/ This growth can be attested to by changes in actions, understandings, values, roles, and themes. Good (1990) points out the limited amount of time pre-service teachers actually spend in professional education courses. Therefore, the undergraduate program focuses on providing a strong theory base and opportunities to analyze practice, either directly in classrooms or through case studies, simulations, or mediated experiences. Reflection, independent and collaborative, is encouraged and required in classes that complement and supplement each other. Curriculum and instruction are structured to insure that what is learned is consequently revisited, reinforced, analyzed, challenged, and evaluated, whether learned through classes or through experience. Throughout the field experience sequence, students are guided in reflective practice through assignments and the seminars in which they are discussed. Student teaching is a final experiential level developmentally, allowing students to assume full responsibility for teaching and learning, but under guidelines and with the support of qualified professionals. The senior portfolio allows students to demonstrate their ability to make decisions based on reflective analysis.

The Reflective Decision Maker is the basis for the graduate program as well as the undergraduate program. Undergraduates emphasize development of a theory base and translating it into practice; graduates focus on integrating the most current research and theory into an existing base, analyzing and challenging both theory and theory when translated into practice, and testing beliefs through problem solving and research. Congruent with the Developmental Model, graduates move from focus on teachers and teaching to students and learning, and to a personal construction of meaning and definition of experience which is constantly challenged, refined, and shared. The respect for research remains, but here becomes a personal commitment, and the user also becomes the producer. Recognition of this growth forms a basis for the degree program and a means to evaluate its effectiveness in terms of the students it serves.

A required Integrative Project provides graduate students the opportunity to document their experiences through construction of a portfolio and to share their learning and growth with other professionals in an oral presentation. Graduates also participate in an exit interview which documents growth and progress throughout the program and to provide feedback to the faculty of the Education Department. The goal of the graduate program would be to continue the education of the reflective teaching professional, building developmentally upon a sound undergraduate and experiential base, combining theory with opportunities for research and reflective assessment.

#### **4. Program completers who teach in the private schools and out of state**

<b>Private Schools:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Out-of-State:</b>	